REMARKS

This is intended as a full and complete response to the Final Office Action dated January 25, 2007, having a shortened statutory period for response set to expire on April 25, 2007. Applicants submit this response to place the application in condition for allowance or in better form for appeal. Please reconsider the claims pending in the application for reasons discussed below.

Claims 1-15 and 17-22 are pending in the application. Claims 1-15 and 17-22 remain pending following entry of this response.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-15, 17-22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by *Davison* (U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0037069). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

The Applicable Law

"A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). "The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim." *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989). The elements must be arranged as required by the claim. *In re Bond*, 910 F.2d 831, 15 USPQ2d 1566 (Fed. Cir. 1990).

The Cited Reference

In rejecting the pending claims, the Examiner cites to *Davison*. *Davison* describes a method and system for providing a framework for processing markup language documents. *See Davison,* Title. In *Davison*, a request is received containing

information that identifies data to be retrieved. *See Davison*, Pg. 4, Paragraph 0064. The request comprises information that identifies a pre-generated database query stored on a server. *See Davison*, Pg. 4, Paragraph 0065. The request comprises a uniform resource locator (URL) which includes information that points to a file or directory containing the pre-generated query. *See Davison*, Pg. 4, Paragraphs 0065-0067. The URL may be parsed to extract a query identifier and the query is located by parsing a library file to locate the particular query specified in the request. *See Davison*, Pg. 4, Paragraphs 0070-0071. The query is then used to query a database. *See Davison*, Pg. 4, Paragraph 0071.

The Examiner's Rejection

The pending claims describe "parsing [an] existing database statement to identify fields and corresponding field attributes" and "generating [a] transactional database statement based on the identified fields and user input". The Examiner states that *Davison* describes "parsing [an] existing database statement to identify fields and corresponding field attributes" at Paragraph 0069 and "generating [a] transactional database statement based on the identified fields and user input" at Paragraphs 0068-0070. In response to Applicants' previous arguments that *Davison* does not teach the claimed subject matter, the Examiner states that the cited sections clearly teach "parsing a library of related queries" to generate a particular query using a query name and query location included in the user's request. *See Final Office Action dated 1-25-07*, Page 10. In response to the Examiner's arguments, Applicants respectfully maintain that *Davison* does not teach the claimed subject matter as described in the previous *Response to Office Action*, and further provide the following arguments.

Applicants' Response

First, with respect to "parsing [an] existing database statement to identify fields and corresponding field attributes", the Examiner maintains that *Davison* describes parsing a library of related queries at Paragraphs 0068-0070. However, as stated in

Davison at Paragraph 0070, a <u>library file</u> is parsed to locate a particular query specified in a request. Thus, *Davison* teaches parsing a <u>library file</u>, and not a query. *See Davison*, Pg. 4, Paragraph 0070. Accordingly, Applicants submit that *Davison* does not teach "parsing [an] existing database statement to identify fields and corresponding field attributes". Therefore, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

With respect to "generating [a] transactional database statement based on the identified fields and user input", the Examiner cites Paragraphs 0068-0070. The cited section describes obtaining a query name "queryname" and a particular location of a pre-generated query on a server. *See Davison* at Pg. 4, Paragraph 0068. The cited section also describes how an administrator pre-generates a set of database queries by writing the queries or using a query design tool. *See Davison* at Pg. 4, Paragraph 0069.

Applicants submit that the cited section does not describe "generating [a] transactional database statement based on the identified fields and user input" for multiple reasons. First, the cited section states that the query name and location are obtained from a URL, and not from a query as suggested by the Examiner. *See Davison*, Pg. 4, Paragraph 0068. Second, the query name and location obtained from the URL describe a file name and location of a file in which a pre-generated query is stored, and do not refer to fields of the pre-generated query as suggested by the Examiner. *See Davison,* Pg. 4, Paragraph 0067-0068. The query name and location are used to locate a pre-generated query. Furthermore, as indicated by the adjective "pre-generated", the located query is generated before the URL identifying the pre-generated query is received. *See Davison,* Pg. 4, Paragraphs 0065-0069. As described above, after being located, the pre-generated query is used to access the database without modification of the pre-generated query. *See Davison,* Pg. 4, Paragraphs 0065-0072. Thus, the information identified by the Examiner (the query name and location) are merely used to locate a pre-generated query, and are not used to generate a query as suggested by the Examiner. *See id.*

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that *Davison* does not teach "parsing [an] existing database statement to identify fields and corresponding field

544585_2

attributes" and "generating [a] transactional database statement based on the identified fields and user input" as described in the pending claims. Therefore, the claims are believed to be allowable, and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

<div align="center">Conclusion</div>

Having addressed all issues set out in the office action, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are in condition for allowance and respectfully request that the claims be allowed.

If the Examiner believes any issues remain that prevent this application from going to issue, the Examiner is strongly encouraged to contact Gero McClellan, attorney of record, at (336) 643-3065, to discuss strategies for moving prosecution forward toward allowance.

Respectfully submitted, and
S-signed pursuant to 37 CFR 1.4,

/Gero G. McClellan, Reg. No. 44,227/
Gero G. McClellan
Registration No. 44,227
PATTERSON & SHERIDAN, L.L.P.
3040 Post Oak Blvd. Suite 1500
Houston, TX 77056
Telephone: (713) 623-4844
Facsimile: (713) 623-4846
Attorney for Applicants